



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A typological switch in early Modern English – and the beginning of one in Dutch?

Citation for published version:

Los, B & Starren, M 2012, 'A typological switch in early Modern English – and the beginning of one in Dutch?', *Leuvense Bijdragen*, vol. 98, no. 1, pp. 98-126. <http://poj.peeters-leuven.be/content.php?url=article&id=2990720&journal_code=LB&download=yes>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Leuvense Bijdragen

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Los, B., & Starren, M. (2012). A typological switch in early Modern English – and the beginning of one in Dutch?. *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 98(1), 98-126

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



A typological switch in early Modern English – and the beginning of one in Dutch?

Bettelou Los & Marianne Starren, Radboud University Nijmegen/CLS

Abstract:

Recent psycholinguistic studies by e.g. Carroll & Lambert (2003), von Stutterheim & Carroll (2005), and von Stutterheim & Rossdeutscher (2005) have uncovered a typological distinction between English and German at the level of macrostructural planning (“deciding what to say and how to say it”) which influences the ways in which events are narrated and scenes are described. This distinction is closely linked to the grammatical options of each language. English is not verb-second but very subject-oriented, and it has a progressive, while German is verb-second, not very subject-oriented and does not have a progressive. Dutch, however, has a progressive of sorts (*aan het*), and claims have been made about Dutch becoming more subject-oriented (eg. Cornelis 2000), although it is still solidly verb-second. Old English sides with German and Dutch in being verb-second, not subject-oriented and not having a progressive of the type of Modern English. This suggests that there was a typological switch, and also that diachronic phenomena which are normally regarded as independent developments - the loss of verb-second and the rise of a progressive - are in fact connected at a deeper level. Dutch presents an interesting case study here, sandwiched as it is between German and English.

1. Introduction: Bounded versus Unbounded Systems

Recent psycholinguistic studies by e.g. Carroll & Lambert (2003), von Stutterheim & Carroll (2005), and von Stutterheim & Rossdeutscher (2005) claim to have uncovered a typological distinction between English and German at the level of macrostructural planning (“deciding what to say and how to say it”) which influences the ways in which events are narrated and scenes are described, and how information is segmented in propositional units. Some of the differences that have to do with temporal segmentation are found in online narratives in the present tense, and depend on the presence (in English) or absence (in German) of a grammaticalized progressive, and the presence (in German) or absence (in English) of a *Vorfeld* created by the verb-second rule. When German and English speakers participating in these studies are asked to describe a narrative sequence (when watching, for instance, a short animation film), German speakers divide the narrative action up into a sequence of temporal segments, each requiring an explicit temporal marker, like *Auf einmal, dann* in (1a) below, typically using the first position before the finite verb (the *Vorfeld*). The English sample of a retelling of the same events from the film shows that the English informants tend to do without such overt temporal sequencers. The event itself is described in open-ended and temporally-unbounded terms by means of expressions for progressive aspect (cf. *hearing, digging, caving in* in (1b)).

(1)a. German:

*Auf einmal hört der Lehmman Wasser tropfen
Und dann gräbt er nach dem Wasser
Bis der Sand dann unter ihm nachgibt*
(von Stutterheim 2002: 25)

b. English:

*The man is hearing the sound of dripping water
and he is digging for the water
and the sand is caving in under him*

The German conceptualization can be visualized as in (2), with no temporal overlapping, and each subevent being closed off before the next subevent begins:

(2) ←subevent 1→ ←subevent 2→ ←subevent 3→

The English conceptualization can be visualized as in (3), with temporal overlapping, and each subevent still open when the next subevent begins:

(3) --- subevent 1---
 --- subevent 2---
 --- subevent 3 ---

The temporal adverbials *auf einmal* and *dann* in (1a) are situated in the first position of the main clause, which in German syntax is a multifunctional position: subjects and objects can appear there, but also adverbials. German (and Dutch) syntax exhibit an asymmetry in word order patterns in main and subclauses: subclauses are verb-final, whereas main clauses have the finite verb in second place. If we take the underlying order to be the Subject-Object-Verb order of the subclause (as suggested by Koster 1975), main clause orders can then be derived by two movement rules: one that puts the finite verb into second position, and a second rule that topicalizes a constituent from the clause into first position. This constituent may be moved from any position in the clause, and may have any syntactic function. These two movement rules have been labelled collectively as “verb-second.”

Carroll et al. (2004) relate the distinction between “bounded” systems such as German and “unbounded” systems such as English to the grammatical options of each language. English is not verb-second but very subject-oriented, and it has a progressive, while German is verb-second, not very subject-oriented and does not have a progressive. Dutch, however, has a progressive of sorts (*aan het*), although it is still solidly verb-second. Old English is verb-second, not subject-oriented and does not have a progressive of the type of Modern English. This suggests that there was a typological switch, and also that diachronic phenomena which are normally regarded as independent developments - the loss of verb-second and the rise of a progressive - could in fact be connected. Dutch presents an interesting case study here, sandwiched as it is between German and English.

2. Verb-Second

The claim is that verb-second makes a special first position available in German that can host adverbials of time like *auf einmal* and *dann* in (1a), and that this makes verb-second one of the grammatical coding options that facilitates a “bounded” system. Although English, too, may start a clause with a time adverbial, there is still a marked difference between English informants and their German counterparts in that the latter go for initial temporal adverbials more often. English informants, on the other hand, tend to be more explicit about causal relationships than the German informants. Carroll & Lambert (2005: 279), reporting on *The Quest* retellings, give ratios of temporal versus causal linkers for English (61.8% temporal/38.1% causal) and German (91.1% temporal/8.9% causal). In online narratives at least, English does not use temporal adverbials with the same frequency as German.

Carroll et al. (2004) and Carroll & Lambert (2005: 269) explicitly mention the absence of the verb-second rule in English as a possible explanation for the lower rates of adverbials, and show that the different adverbial rates are even more marked with spatial adverbials. They argue that the difference goes deeper than just a difference in frequency – they claim that German

speakers tend to assign topic status to “spaces and places” in another experiment (Carroll & Lambert 2005: 270). When asked to describe a picture depicting a busy town centre, English informants give a global topic (4a), and then proceed to describe what they see by means of existential *there*-clauses:

- (4) a. This is a picture of a busy square.
 b. There is a square with a fountain... (Carroll and Lambert 2003: 269)

The German informants do not set a global topic but plunge right in, pinpointing where every item is by means of a clause-initial adverbial of place:

- (5) a. Auf der linken Seite ist eine Apotheke
 On the left side is a drugstore

 b. Vorne im Bild ist eine Strasse
 at the front of the picture is a street

This difference makes for a more detailed, more fine-grained description.

Further support for the idea that clause-initial adverbials of place are more circumscribed in English than clause-initial temporal adverbials is provided by Biber et al. (1999: 802), who give overall rates for temporal adverbials as 20% initial, 25% medial, and 55% final for all the clauses in the British National Corpus that have a temporal adverbial. This is in marked contrast to adverbials of place in initial position. Biber et al. (1999: 803) give their rates for initial position of place adverbials as 5% (against 5% medial, and 90% final position) for all clauses that have a place adverbial. Time adverbials are more likely than place adverbials to appear clause-initially in English, probably because they have an additional text structuring function; see e.g. Virtanen (1992).

The primary function of clause-initial place adverbials in English has been described as framesetting (Chafe, quoted in Krifka 2007: 45), as in (6) (Ibid.); the adverbials are given in italics:

- (6) A: How is business going for Daimler-Chrysler?
 B: [*In GERMANY*]_{Frame} the prospects are [GOOD]_{Focus},
 but [*in AMERICA*]_{Frame} they are [losing MONEY]_{Focus}.

Framesetting sets up the background that limits the scope of a proposition, hence the sense of contrast (‘here, but not there’). In German and Dutch, clause-initial place adverbials can be framesetters (and hence contrastive), but they need not be – they can also be non-contrastive, as they are in the German examples of (5).

The link with verb-second that is proposed by Carroll & Lambert (2005) to account for this difference is particularly interesting as the verb-second rule was operative in earlier English: the finite verb in the main clause moved to a higher position in the clause, and a single constituent from anywhere in the clause moved to the first position. It was only in the course of the fifteenth century that English developed the order Subject-Verb-Object in both main and subclauses as its canonical order, with the subject as the unmarked starting point of a clause. In terms of production and processing, clause-initial, pre-subject adverbials represent a complicating factor: they are not there by default, hence are marked, and “costly”. In a verb-second language,

by contrast, every first constituent could be argued to be “costly” in that none of them start out in that position, but have to be moved there from elsewhere, even the subject.

Why would such a laborious system like verb-second develop in the first place? Los (2012) argues on the basis of the evidence from Old English (van Kemenade 1987, van Kemenade & Westergaard 2012), and Old High German (Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2010: 319) that this verb-movement may originally have arisen from two separate motivations: (i) to demarcate focus domains (in the form of *wh*-constituents or contrastively-focused constituents), as still in Hungarian (Comrie 1989: 63); or (ii) to demarcate topics and background domains from new information (with subjects, objects or adverbials all encoding given information in first position). This is in line with Lambrecht’s insight (Lambrecht 1994: 31–2) that the first position of a main clause is a “cognitively privileged position” for which topics and foci naturally compete. The second motivation has become obscured in German and Dutch because verb-second syntacticized and became the rule for all types of first constituents, but can be detected in the different positions for pronominal subjects in Old English and Old High German in non-*wh* contexts. If the first constituent is an object, or an adverbial, it follows the finite verb, as in (7) below (relevant verb here is *is*), as in Dutch and German. If the subject in such clauses is a pronoun, it precedes rather than follows the finite verb (creating a verb-third rather than verb-second main clause), as in the first clause in (7) (relevant verb *bodade*) or (8) (relevant verb *gefullode*). All finite verbs are in bold:

- (7) Cristes fulluht he **bodade** towearð eallum geleafullum:
 Christ’s baptism he proclaimed to all faithful
on ðam is synna forgyfenyss. þurh ðone halgan gast;
 in that is sins forgiveness through the holy ghost <CHom I, 25, 352.14>¹
 ‘He proclaimed Christ’s baptism to all the faithful: in that is forgiveness of sins, through the Holy Ghost’
- (8) He **bodode** mannum þæs hælendes tocyme mid wordum:
 he predicted to-men the saviour’s coming with words
 and his halige fulluht mid his agenum fulluhte:
 and his holy baptism with his own baptism
on þam he gefullode þone unsynnian godes sunu.
 In that he baptized the sinless son of God
 þe nanre synne forgyfensse ne **behofode**; < CHom I, 25, 352.18>
 who of-no sin forgiveness not needed
 ‘He predicted to people the coming of the Saviour by means of words, and his holy baptism by his own baptism. In that baptism he baptized the sinless Son of God, who had no sins that needed to be forgiven’

Note that this positional difference between pronominal and nominal subjects makes sense if the finite verb (originally) moved to demarcate an area for given information: Christ’s baptism in (7) links to the previous discourse and is hence given, while the following pronominal subject *he*

¹ The reference to an OE text enclosed in <> follows the system of short titles as employed in Healey & Venezky (1985 [1980]) (in turn based on the system of Mitchell, Ball and Cameron 1975, 1979). It is identical to the TEI reference in the Toronto Corpus, which means that line numbers refer to the beginning of the sentence rather than the line in which the relevant structure occurs.

refers to John the Baptist, who has also been mentioned previously. Pronouns are given by definition. *Toweward eallum geleafum* ‘to all the faithful’ is new. Similarly, in (8), *on þam* ‘in that’ is a link to the previous discourse, and *he*, again, as a pronoun, is given information by definition, here referring to that same John the Baptist.

The tendency to move from given to new information in a clause is fairly universal (Principle of Natural Information Flow, Comrie 1989; Firbas 1964), and earlier English is no different in this respect than Present-Day English. What is different is that earlier English has two default positions to express given information: the adverbial, and the (pronominal) subject, both preceding the finite verb. Present-Day English has only one default position for given information: the subject. Although adverbials in earlier English may also express temporal and spatial “topics” in the sense of Carroll & Lambert (as in German (1a) and (5) above), the most coherent generalization about the first position is its linking function: *Auf der linken Seite* and *Vorne im Bild* both contain definite, identifiable, entities that have been introduced, or can be inferred, from the previous discourse, on a par with the two instances of *on þam/on ðam* ‘in that’ in the Old English passages in (7)-(8) – unlike the frame-setters *in Germany* and *in America* in (6). Even the German temporal adverbial *dann* in (1a) contains an element “d-” that is etymologically connected to the demonstratives.

Our claim is that the loss of verb-second in English is much more than the loss of a word order option. In German, as, we will argue, in Old English, there is no direct mapping of pragmatic function (given information, discourse linking) and syntactic function (subject), as in Present-Day English. The first position is dedicated to deixis, to topic-hood; subjects may move there, but also adverbials and objects. If adverbials and objects express topic-time and topic-place, the subject can either express an aboutness-topic in that it encodes what we will call an protagonist – a pronominal subject (like *er* ‘he’ in (1a)) referring to identifiable entities that may well be the main players in a narrative (like *der Lehmann* ‘the clay man’ in (1a)), or introduce a new entity or protagonist (like *synna forgyfenys* ‘forgiveness of sins’ in (7)). Old English shows this subdivision of two kinds of subject (a given one and a new one) more clearly than German or Dutch in that the Old English finite verb rises to a lower position than in the other two languages, as we saw in (7) and (8). With the subject “reserved” for aboutness-topics/protagonists, the first position was free to develop from a purely linking function into an automatic and even pathological drive to reset topic place and topic time for every new discourse move. The effect is that English narrators in the psycholinguistic experiments that have yielded data such as (1b) tend to focus on the fact *that* something happens, where the German speakers focus much more on *when* and *where* it happens.

English adverbials show a decline in referentiality over time in that they tend to encode new information more often in Present-Day English than in Early Modern English or Late Middle English (Pérez-Guerra 2005: 357ff). If presubject place adverbials are restricted to frame-setters, referring forward rather than backward in Present-Day English, as in (6), and are no longer links to the preceding discourse, a loss in referentiality over the years is just what we would expect. This has consequences for the role of the subject, which has to take on a heavier functional load (encoding aboutness-topic/protagonist as well as discourse links), as we will discuss in a later section. The next section first investigates what it means to be a verb-second language, and investigates our hypothesis that the first constituent in a verb-second language is a dedicated linking position and hence shows an affinity with deictic elements.

3. Deictic elements in first constituents

Our first task is to investigate whether Present-Day English has lower rates of clauses starting with a non-subject than Old English, Dutch, or German, as a result of the operation of the verb-second rule. Table 1 shows the proportions of subject-initial, adverbial-initial and object-initial main clauses in various investigations reported in the literature for three verb-second languages: German, Dutch and Swedish.

Corpus studies	Subject first in %	Adverbial first in %	Other first in %
German spoken corpus (Engel 1974: 212–5)	51	35	14
German newspaper corpus (Fabricius-Hansen & Solfjeld 1994: 101–2)	54	35.8	9.2
Dutch spoken corpus (Bouma 2008: 97, 279–83)	68	26	6
Swedish (Bohnacker & Rosén 2007: 36)	73	23	4

Table 1. Rates of subjects versus other first constituents in declaratives with an overt first constituent in German, Dutch, and Swedish

The rates of subject-first vary, from about 50% in German to 75% in Swedish (both written corpora). Interestingly, Dutch is closer to Swedish than to German; the fact that we are comparing spoken with written corpora here makes it difficult to speculate why.

The diachronic picture is shown in Table 2, which is based on more homogenous corpora than Table 1. The Old English narrative text *Joseph in Egypt* from the Old English *Genesis* has been compared to a retelling of the *Joseph in Egypt* story from *The Message Bible*, which is a free translation of the original Greek in colloquial, idiomatic Present-Day English (Peterson 2009). These figures are based on Los (2009). The other figures rely on a comparison presented by Chamonikolasová (2009) of the Old English *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and a modern-day chronicle (*The Chronicle of Britain and Ireland*). Table 2 also shows figures from the entire parsed and annotated Old English corpus (the YCOE corpus; Taylor et al. 2003) and the entire parsed and annotated Late Modern English corpus (1720–1910) (Kroch et al. 2010) (Los & Dreschler 2012).

	Subject in %	Adverbial in %	Other in %
OE (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Chamonikolasová 2009)	20	50	30
OE (Joseph in Egypt , <Gen (Ker)>)	44	31	25
OE, YCOE corpus, Taylor et al. (2003)	44	36	20
PDE (Chronicle of Britain and Ireland, Chamonikolasová 2009)	70	30	0
PDE (Joseph in Egypt, <i>The Message Bible</i>)	68	23	9
LModE corpus, Kroch et al. (2010)	64	21	25

Table 2. Rates of subjects versus other first constituents in Old English (OE) and Present-Day English (PDE) chronicles and narratives in all declaratives

Old English and German appear to pattern together, as do Present-Day English and – surprisingly for verb-second languages – Swedish and Dutch. This spread seems to indicate that verb-second is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon: there is a scale.

The plot thickens when we take into account that Swedish students learning German have an unexpected problem acquiring German verb-second – unexpected because both Swedish and German are verb-second languages. As it turns out, it is not the second position of the finite verb that presents problems; it is a difference in the nature of the first constituent in the two languages (Bohnacker & Rosén 2007). The Swedish learners in the study started too many of their German sentences with subjects, and favoured existential, “empty” subjects at markedly higher rates, “organizing and structuring information in a way that native German readers find odd and unidiomatic” (ibid. 31). Bohnacker and Rosén claim that the most significant difference between Swedish and German is that the latter language uses the first position primarily for discourse reference and text cohesion, with a large proportion (some 30 per cent²) of the nonsubject-first constituents (i.e. the adverbials in first position) consisting of one of the so-called *Pronominaladverbien* “pronominal adverbs,” adverbs formed by an anaphor like *da* ‘there’ and a preposition: *dazu* ‘there-to’, *darauf* ‘there-on’, *daran* ‘thereon’, *damit* ‘there-with’, *davon* ‘there-of’, *darum* ‘there-about’, *dafür* ‘there-for’, *danach* ‘there-after’ (ibid.: 49). The preference for such deictics is also reflected by a high frequency of the temporal adverb *dann* ‘then’ in first position – which represents the temporal topic resetting of the bounded system, as we saw in the previous section. With the findings from the psycholinguistic research into bounded and unbounded systems of von Stutterheim & Carroll (2005), von Stutterheim & Rosseide (2005), Carroll et al. (2004) and Carroll & Lambert (2005) in mind (see the discussion of (4) and (5) above), we can now place the heavy reliance of German speakers on pronominal adverbs in the topic position as a feature of bounded systems: the tendency for explicit topic resetting and discourse linking with every discourse move. The contrast with Swedish appears to be that the first position in German appears to be earmarked for such links, but not in Swedish. Verb-second, then, appears to be a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for such earmarking.

Although Dutch sides with Swedish and PDE, against German and OE, with respect of the syntactic function of its first constituent (at least in spoken Dutch), it sides with German and

² Bohnacker & Rosén’s (2007) German controls used pronominal adverbs as first constituent to a rate of 11 per cent overall (of all first constituents), which works out as some 30 per cent of all adverbial first constituents.

OE (against Swedish and PDE) in that it, too, shows a link between the first constituent and deixis. This is shown in Table 3 by the figures for first constituents containing deictic elements, including forms of *there/here, then, thus* etc. See <http://erwinkomen.ruhosting.nl/results/> for details. The data of Northern Dutch and Flemish Dutch are from the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (Corpus of Spoken Dutch), which contains scripted and unscripted speech.³ The data of the various historical English periods are based on the entire parsed and annotated Old English corpus (Taylor et al. 2003), the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (Kroch and Taylor 2000), the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (Kroch et al. 2004) and the Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English (Kroch et al. 2010).

	Northern Dutch		Flemish Dutch		Total CGN	English			
	Unscripted	Scripted	Unscripted	Scripted		Old English	Middle English	Early ModE	Late modE
FirstConst	34118	4399	16583	3746	58846	66425	56805	63969	39677
FirstConst (Dword)	12535	1094	5346	522	19497	14441	8495	5443	2945
FirstConst (Dadv)	3801	253	1288	141	5483	12551	6278	4247	917
FirstConst (Dadv + Dword)	47,9%	30,6%	40,0%	17,7%	42,4%	40,6%	26,0%	15,1%	9,7%

Table 3: Ratios of main clause initial constituents with and without deictic elements. Data collected by Erwin Komen and Rosanne Hebing, see <http://erwinkomen.ruhosting.nl/results>

Note that these constituents are single adverbs (as adverbials) and demonstratives (as subjects and objects) rather than adverbial PPs or NP subjects and objects containing demonstratives. There is a very marked difference in Table 3 between the Corpus Spoken Dutch data and the Old English data on the one hand, and the late Modern English data on the other hand. The historical English corpora show a decline in the frequency of deictic elements in the first constituent.

The reasons behind the decline require further research, but there are a number of pointers that become clear from studying Bouma's data of the first constituent in Dutch (Bouma 2008). Many first-constituent subjects and objects in Dutch contain demonstratives. Dutch *die/dat* and German *der/die/das* in clause initial position contrast with personal pronouns *hij/zij/het* and *er/sie/es* in referring back very precisely to the focus of the previous clause, and making that focus the new topic (*Topic Shift*, see Comrie 2000, van Kampen 2007, 2010). This is why a text like (9) which appeared in a Dutch newspaper raises Dutch eyebrows because *die* 'that one' can only refer back to the perpetrator (Van der L.), not to the victim (the neighbour), although this interpretation fails to make sense - why would the neighbour arouse van der L.'s anger if it is Van der L. who is reported as having done something reprehensible (littering his neighbour's garden):

(9) Zestien jaar en tbs voor 'hamermoord'

³ Unscripted = CGN text categories a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,m,n; Scripted = CGN text categories j,k,l,o; for details, see the CGN website: <http://lands.let.ru.nl/cgn/>

Een 33-jarige Dordtenaar die vorig jaar zijn buurman vermoordde met een hamer en een mes, is gisteren veroordeeld tot zestien jaar gevangenisstraf en tbs met dwangverpleging. Het slachtoffer had de woede van Van der L. gewekt, toen **die** een peuk van zijn balkon schoot. (*Trouw* 23 March 2011)

‘Sixteen years and Detention during Her Majesty’s Pleasure for hammer killing
 A 33-year-old man from Dordrecht who murdered his neighbour last year with a hammer and a knife was sentenced to sixteen years and Detention during Her Majesty’s Pleasure yesterday. The victim had aroused Van der L_i’s anger when he_i threw a cigarette end from his_i balcony.’

This peculiar text turned out to be a truncated version of another text - it was the ill-advised removal of the final sentence, here given as (10), that had caused the misunderstanding:

- (10) De buurman reageerde met een afkeurend gebaar, waarop de Dordtenaar kwaad werd (*nos.nl*, 23 maart)
 ‘The neighbour responded with a gesture of disapproval, after which the man from Dordrecht became angry.’

So *die* refers back to Van der L. after all.

The 14% drop in the transition of Old to Middle English may well be explained by the loss of this system, or one very like it, in Old English. Old English demonstratives *se/seo/þæt* similarly contrasted with personal pronouns *he/heo/hit*, although *se/seo/þæt* does not appear to have been used exclusively for Topic Shift but could also be used for a continued topic. In Present-Day English, only the plural demonstrative *those* can refer to people (Huddleston & Pullum 2002); singular reference can only be done by personal pronouns, which means that there is no mechanism in Present-day English to express Topic Shift. The loss of *se/seo/þæt* in English (and the loss of grammatical gender) dates from about 1200 (Smith 1996: 147-149; McColl Millar 2000). With the loss of the *se/seo/þæt* paradigm, English not only lost a subject and object demonstratives referring to people, but also the very specific reference of the *se/seo/þæt* system. Compare the two instances of *on þam/on ðam* ‘in that’ in the Old English passages in (7)-(8) with their Present-Day English translations – a literal Present-Day English translation is probably just about acceptable in (7), but (8) requires the addition of a specific noun (‘in that baptism’). Another example is (11):

- (11) *Be þam awrat Moyses se mæra heretoga, In principio*
fecit Deus celum
 By those wrote Moses the great general, In principio fecit
Deus celum
et terram <ÆHom I, 70, 46> (quoted in van Kemenade 2009: 99–100)
et terram
 ‘About those words Moyses the great general wrote: In principio fecit Deus celum et terram...’

The translation shows that Present-Day English requires a more specific link to the preceding discourse, both for structural and paradigmatic reasons. Van Kemenade, Milicev and Baayen (2008) note that Old English demonstratives, when used as “definite determiners” in a NP, not

only made that NP definite and identifiable but also gave it a specific reference to a discourse antecedent, probably because of their morphological marking (for gender and number). Note that the PPs of *on þam/on ðam* ‘in that’ in (7-8) and *Be þam* ‘by those’ in (11) would have been expressed by the *Pronominaladverbien* noted by Bohnacker and Rosén (2007) in their control group of German native speakers. Old English also had such a system of pronominal adverbs containing an explicitly deictic pronominal element (*þærmid* ‘therewith’, *þærto* ‘thereto’, etc.). The decline of such pronominal adverbs in English has been charted by Lenker, who has investigated clausal connectors of cause and result and has found a “complete restructuring” of the system of clausal connection in eME (Lenker 2007: 215; 2010), from about 1250 onwards – this same transitional period from Old to Middle English, where we see a marked drop in deictic elements in Table 3.

There is a connection here with another restriction that sets demonstratives in Present-Day English apart from those in Dutch and Old English: their use as independent heads. Present-Day English requires the addition of the pro-form *one*, which did not exist in Old English and does not have a counterpart in Dutch. *One* goes some way towards restoring specific reference in the new determiner system: *It was, frankly, a hypothesis--albeit an excellent one*. Note that Modern Dutch and German have retained attributive gender-licensed inflection and do not need proforms for that reason; the German system is far more articulate, but even the attributive inflection in Dutch, worn down to *schwa* for common gender and zero for neuter singular indefinite, provides sufficient contrast to establish a gender-specific link:

- (12) welke broek trek je aan, de blauwe?
 which trousers put you on the blue-infl
 ‘which trousers will you put on, the blue one?’

Paradigmatically, Modern English demonstratives are morphologically too impoverished to point unambiguously to particular NPs as their antecedents, and it seems that it was this unambiguous reference property that was responsible for their clear specifying function.

4. The decline of Verb-Second in English

The second drop in deictic elements in first constituents in English is in the transitional period from Middle English to Early Modern English, a drop of another 14% (Table 3). Verb-second starts to decline in the Middle English period, for reasons that are as yet not fully understood; the bulk of the loss can be pinpointed to the fifteenth century (Fischer et al. 2000; Warner 2007; van Kemenade & Westergaard 2012). The connection between the drop in deictic first constituents in this period and the loss of verb-second is the loss of adverbials as default linkers (in (7-8) and (11), with only frame-setters as in (6) remaining. Late Middle English is in fact like Swedish with its high rates of subject-first clauses, ungendered demonstrative system, expletive subjects rather than discourse links, and verb-second. Swedish has verb-second by inheritance (Old Norse was a verb-second language, Kroch, Taylor & Ringe 2000), just like Middle English, but the question of whether verb-second is a receding feature in Swedish is beyond the scope of this paper.

An investigation into deictic elements in adverbial first constituents (rather than in any first constituent) is presented in table 4. Table 4 reports on adverbial phrases (PPs) and adverbial clauses in first position in the two versions of the Joseph of Egypt story that figured in Table 2. It is clear that Present-Day English has fewer adverbial phrases in first position, which confirms the restriction to frame-setting in example (6) as opposed to discourse links in (7-8) and (11), but

more adverbial clauses (as has also been found in Tavecchio's 2010 comparison of Dutch and English texts).

Adverbial	Clausal:	Phrasal, non-deictic:	Phrasal, deictic:
OE:	37	17	114 (68%)
PDE:	48	22	32 (31%)

Table 4. Deictic elements in first constituent adverbials in the OE *Genesis* text and the PDE translation of *The Message Bible*

A lot of these deictic linkers are of the *þa* (*þa*)... , *þa* type ('then, (when...), then...'), as in (13):

- (13) *ða* he on his wege rad, *þa* beseah he on þæt eadigan mæden,
then he on his way rode, then looked he on that blessed maiden
þær þe hi sæt wlitig and fæger onmang hire geferan.
there where she sat beautiful and fair among her companions
ða cwæð he to his cnihtum: Ridað hraþe to þære fæmnan and axiað hire,
then said he to his servants ride quickly to that girl and ask her
gif hi seo frig. < LS 14 (MargaretAss) 53–4 >
if she is free
'When he was riding on his way, he beheld that blessed maiden where she was sitting
among her companions, beautiful and fair; then he said to his servants: "Ride quickly to
that girl and ask her if she is free."' "

This type is typical of the correlative, paratactic constructions of Old English that rely heavily of deictic elements (for the development of such paratactic linking to hypotaxis in English, see Kiparsky 1994). A construction with *þa* 'then' in first position also has an important foregrounding function in narrative (see Los 2005 and the references there for a discussion), not only in Old English, but also in spoken Dutch (and perhaps also in spoken German, witness the very similar use of *dann* in (1a)). Note that the *þa*-correlative construction relies not only on the availability of deictic elements, but also on verb-second syntax in the sense that there must be an syntactically-unmarked adverbial main clause first position – this is where the second and third *þas* in (13) are situated. There is a related construction that was lost, at least very seriously restricted, in English, with the loss of verb-second, but which still flourishes in (spoken) Dutch: Contrastive Left Dislocation. Contrastive Left Dislocation similarly relies on the combination of deixis and verb-second syntax and may well be responsible for the marked difference between unscripted and scripted parts of the Spoken Dutch Corpus in Table 3, which appears to indicate a difference between spoken versus written language (Jansen 1981:2), see also de Vries (2007). Compare Contrastive Left Dislocation in (14a) (as opposed to (14b)):

- (14) a. Dat probleem, dat snap ik niet.
b. Dat probleem snap ik niet.

Ball, in her study of the history of the *it*-cleft in English, notes that this same passage in earlier translations could use a correlative construction with a left-dislocated constituent that was correlatively connected to the main clause by *therefore* 'for that':

- (15) Forwhy fair ne precyous were thei nat for that thei comen among thi ryches; but **for they semeden fair and precyous, therefore** thou haddest levere rekne hem among thi ryches. (Chaucer's translation of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Bo 2.pr5.108; Ball 1991: 482)
 'But **it** is because they are fair and precious that you wanted to reckon them among your riches.' (Watts Present-Day English translation of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, quoted in Ball 1991).

We have a *for...*, *therefore* Contrastive Left Dislocation structure here that relies on the unmarked adverbial position made available by verb-second for *therefore*,⁴ and the specific reference of *there* in *therefore* to establish the link with the left-dislocated *for*-clause. Ball shows that Present-Day English cannot reproduce the construction for these two reasons, and has to resort to an *it*-cleft (witness the PDE translation of (15)).

To return to the psycholinguistic research of bounded versus unbounded retellings: the combination of verb-second syntax and the expressions for deixis may well have led to a situation in which the linking is primarily done by adverbials in narratives, with the subject position reserved for the expression of protagonists. This may have led to the fine-grained attention to details of time and place in German (and hence, probably also in Old English and Dutch), as opposed to Present-Day English, in which adverbial first constituents are no longer available as unmarked choices. The subject in English is the only unmarked choice after the loss of verb-second, and hence carries a heavy functional load.

5. The subject in English

The psycholinguistic experiments do not only show a difference in first position adverbial linking, but also the role of the subject. Von Stutterheim and Carroll (2005) argue that the functional load of the subject, in information-structural and discourse terms, is lighter in German: with the first constituent encoding unmarked discourse linking in terms of spatial or temporal segmentation, the role of the subject tends to be restricted to expressing the protagonist of the event, and this protagonist's identity tends to be maintained throughout longer stretches of discourse than in English, which in turn allows the subject to be ellipted more often, as its stability makes it easy to recover (Ibid.) If we take into account the function of the subject in Present-Day English as the default expression of a link to the immediate discourse that we identified in the previous section, we can extend the findings of Von Stutterheim and Carroll to argue that the Present-Day English subject does triple duty: not only does it serve to encode such local links as may still be required (as in (16) below), it also serves to encode the protagonist, and, additionally, to encode any "players" other than the protagonist in an event, like *The wind* in (21b) below. It is not surprising, then, that English has developed strategies to encode links in subjects that are not found in Old English, Dutch and German. One strategy is new passive constructions, as in (16):

- (16) a. John was alleged/rumoured/said to be lying/*They alleged/rumoured/said John to be lying.

⁴ Note that the surface verb-third order of (15) [*therefore you have...*] is still verb-second in the sense of movement of the finite verb; it is just the verb ends up in a lower position when the first position is not filled by a *wh*-phrase or a negation. See the discussion of example (4).

- b. The doctor was sent for.
- c. He was given a book.

With the function of encoding unmarked discourse links losing its dedicated first position, and now having to be expressed by the subject, new strategies emerge to create subjects after verb-second is lost, in Late Middle English and Early Modern English. For the rise of prepositional passives like (16b), see Denison (1985). Passivized indirect objects do not emerge until the Late Modern English period (see Visser 1963-1973). Significantly, Exceptional Case-Marking constructions are often only acceptable in the passive, not in the active (witness (16a)), and this has been a feature of the construction from its first emergence (Warner 1982, Fischer 1989, Fanego 1992). As actives are considered syntactically more basic than passives, which are generally analyzed as being derived from actives by a syntactic operation, this phenomenon requires an explanation. A first suggestion of what might be going on was given by Mair (1990) in a corpus study of infinitives. Noting the predominance of passives in his corpus, he hypothesized that such passives allowed the link to the previous discourse to be made by the subject. This is illustrated in (17):

- (17) Thanks to the ubiquitous television set, the best known Canadians in Britain are, quite possibly, Bernard Braden, Hughie Green and Robert McKenzie. Others more talented-- Jon Vickers, Lynn Seymour, Mordecai Richler, Sir William Butlin, John Hemming, Oscar Petersen, Garfield Weston, Paul Anka, Glenn Ford, Yvonne de Carlo, Raymond Burr, Donald Sutherland and Christopher Plummer--are probably seldom identified as Canadians. *Many of them* are generally assumed to be Americans, which raises the whole struggle to maintain a separate identity from her giant neighbour. (Mair 1990: 180)

What would a verb-second system have had to offer as an alternative to (17)? In a verb-second language like Dutch, any constituent before the finite verb may constitute a link to the previous discourse, and, as there are no syntactic or categorial restrictions on the first position, it follows that Dutch unmarked themes do not have to be subjects, but can be adverbials, or objects. Compare the Dutch translations of (17), provided in (18), which unproblematically start off with a non-subject constituent *van deze mensen* ‘of these people’:

- (18) a. Van deze mensen neemt men meestal aan dat ze Amerikanen zijn
 of these people takes one generally on that they Americans are
 b. Van deze mensen wordt meestal aangenomen dat ze Amerikanen zijn.
 of these people is generally taken-on that they Americans are

Two other developments point to the importance of the subject as the only unmarked clause beginning: one is the transformation of expletive *there* in existentials as in (4b): in origin a deictic adverb in the pragmatically-unmarked first position made available by verb-second syntax, but in Present-Day English no longer capable of specific deictic reference (witness *therefore* in (15)) and syntactically a subject, as is clear from the fact that it pops up in tag-questions, which is the exclusive preserve of subjects (*there is ... , isn't there?*).

The second development is the extreme “permissiveness” of Present-Day English subjects which has long been noted in the literature; some examples are presented in (19), from Hawkins (1986: 58–61), based on Rohdenburg (1974); many of these permissive subjects are not possible in Dutch and German, as the translations show:

- (19) a. English: A few years ago a penny would buy two or three pins.
 b. Dutch: Met een kwartje kon je vroeger een ijsje kopen.
 c. English: This hotel forbids dogs.
 d. German: In diesem Hotel sind Hunde verboten.
 e. English: This trial cannot proceed.
 f. German: Wir können mit dem Prozeß nicht fortfahren.
 g. English: The latest edition of the book has dropped a chapter.
 h. German: In der letzten Ausgabe des Buches ist ein kapitel hinzugefügt.
 i. English: The roof of the tunnel was seeping water.
 j. German: Durch die Tunneldecke sickerte Wasser (durch).
 k. English: This loses us the best centre forward.
 l. German: Damit haben wir den besten Mittelstürmer verloren.

Hawkins and Rohdenburg note that these subjects would tend to be coded as prepositional phrases in German, and Dutch sides with German here. Hawkins (1986) offers a number of prepositional phrase alternatives (as in (20)), but they either appear in clause-final position, or evoke contrastive focus - we would say, because they have become frame-setters as in (6) above. Prepositional phrases appear in italics.

- (20) a. *With this advertisement* we will sell a lot.
 b. Dogs are forbidden *in this hotel*.
 c. We cannot proceed *with the trial*.
 d. *Through the tunnel roof* seeped water.
 e. *On account of this* we have lost the best centre forward.

Dutch sides with German in having a multifunctional clause-initial linking position, unlike English, which has to rope in the subject to do its linking. Dutch and German also use the position to ground every discourse move in time (narratives) and space (descriptions), and achieves this “bounding” because of this special position. English does not have this position, and instead has developed a grammaticalized progressive which allows it to make do without bounding.

4. The progressive

Where speakers of unbounded languages opt for a progressive form in their descriptions, as in English (1b), and again in (21b), speakers of bounded languages like German prefer anchoring in space and time (cf. *auf hohen, schäumenden Wellen* in (21a), and this is frequently done by means of temporal adverbs like *dann* in (1a), (21a)); their language may well lack an expression for the progressive altogether:

- (21)
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. German: | b. English: |
| Ein kleiner Mann surft auf den Wellen. | A young man is surfing. |
| ‘A little man surfs on the waves.’ | |
| Dann wird er plötzlich von dem Brett geweht. | The wind is blowing him off the board. |
| ‘Then he is suddenly from the board thrown.’ | |

(Carroll, von Stutterheim & Nuese 2004: 190)

The perspective of a speaker of a bounded language follows the event from within, as a participant, whereas the perspective of speakers of an unbounded language follows the event from without, as if through the eye of a camera recording the scene (Carroll, von Stutterheim and Nuese 2004). Note that the German informant in (21a) keeps his or her subject position reserved for the protagonist, but the English informant switches to a different subject: an inanimate force, *the wind*, that is not mentioned explicitly by the German informant. These findings of perspective and attention in *The Quest* narratives have been confirmed by eye-tracking studies: when asked to describe short episodes on video, i.e. of people walking in the countryside, English speakers focus their gaze on the people and launch into their narrative description almost immediately. The gaze of the German speakers, by contrast, not only focuses on the people walking, in the left of the frame, but also swerves to the right of the picture, apparently because these speakers, as speakers of a bounded language, need to make out the goal of the walk first, because they need a boundary to ground the event; consequently, they take significantly longer than the English speakers before they start to speak. When asked to describe a scene of a train travelling at speed through a landscape, this need for a goal was apparently so strong that many German speakers described the train as travelling towards a station, even though no station was visible in the film (Carroll, Natale & Starren 2008). This phenomenon seems related to the fine granularity of time and place in descriptions that we saw in examples (4) and (5).

Referring to specific events requires grounding. Finiteness by itself is a grounder (see 21a/b), as is embedding the situation as the complement of a perception verb in an Accusative-and-infinitive construction (AcI) (Dutch: *ik zie iemand surfen*, English: *I see someone surfing*). It is interesting that the use of a grammaticalized progressive is one of the mechanisms that allows the English speakers to be less focused on temporal or spatial end-points to ground events: the English speaker who says *A young man is surfing* may leave the space over which the young man surfs implicit; but the German speaker apparently does not have this option, although a simple present tense like *surft* is supposed to be imperfective by default in Dutch and German. There is a strong sense that the space needs to be added explicitly (*auf den Wellen* ‘on the waves’ in (21a)), in spite of the fact that surfing is generally understood to be an activity that involves waves. The same goes for *De trein rijdt* in the train-travelling-through-a-landscape video: *Ik zie een trein rijden* appears to be more acceptable. Although German does not have a grammaticalized progressive, Dutch has - the “locative” *aan-het* construction, which should in theory be available for train-travelling-through-a-landscape events – but although it is grammatical (witness (22b)), it is not the construction that informants use:

- (22) a. De trein is aan het rijden.
b. De trein is door een landschap aan het rijden.

Boogaart (1999) presents the following table to visualize the various expressions of progressive aspect in English and Dutch:

Mode	narrative			
Aktionsart	state		event	
Aspect	perfective	imperfective	perfective	imperfective
English	simple past	prog	simple past	prog

Dutch	perf	simple past	simple past	perf	simple past	simple past	aan het
-------	------	-------------	-------------	------	-------------	-------------	---------

Table 5: The expressions of perfective and imperfective aspect in English and Dutch (adapted from Boogaart 1999)

The table shows that the *aan-het* progressive does not cover nearly as much ground as the English progressive, and this is confirmed by a comparison of English and Dutch retellings of *The Quest*: the *aan het* progressive is rarely used: the English participants average 27.6 progressives per individual, against an average of 1.1 progressives of the Dutch participants, with some Dutch participants not using progressives at all (Bouwmans 2009). Dutch participants were more focused on endpoints than the English participants: 15.75 versus 10.6 endpoints per individual, and a similar difference emerged for the rate of adverbials overall: 28.9 adverbials versus 12.75 per individual (Ibid.). Dutch, then, appears to side with German rather than English, in spite of its *aan het*-progressive.

The rise of the *-ing* progressive in early Modern English has always been viewed as an isolated coincidence, unrelated to any other change (Killie 2008, Kranich 2010); in the context of the bounded versus unbounded typology, however, it can be argued to have been a necessity: if syntax no longer made available a position to express the topic-time and topic-place required by a bounded system, this could be compensated by the open-endedness of the progressive which would obviate the need for temporal and spatial segmentation.

Dutch has a more functional periphrastic progressive construction (*aan het V*) but this construction is not yet fully grammaticalized and its application is much more limited than that of the progressive in Present-Day English, as a comparison of Dutch and PDE *The Quest* retellings testifies (see also Carroll, Natale & Starren 2008).

(23) Dutch *The Quest* retelling with progressive:

a. Dan zie je de machine bezig.

Then you see the machine working/at work (lit. 'busy').

b. Een grijper is dingen *aan het pakken*.

A bucket is scooping things up.

(24) Dutch *The Quest* retelling without progressive (same speaker as in (20)):

Er komt een machine richting hem die hem volgens mij plat gaat drukken.

'A machine is coming towards him, which I think will crush him.'

One of the options available to speakers of English to describe an action with a progressive is a combination of *see/hear* with an *-ing* form, cf. (25a-c) and (26), which are typical retellings of two episodes from English *Quest*-database:

(25) a. He wakes up to see a large piece blowing directly towards him

b. and you see this piece of paper flying right at him

c. so he sees it flying at him

(26) from the top of the cairn he looks around and sees water dripping on a rock

Van Gelderen (2004) claims that using the bare infinitive in (27a) has only been ungrammatical from around 1800 onwards. She uses the ungrammaticality of (27a) in Present-Day English as a diagnostic of the completion of the grammaticalization process of the progressive – it is found in English texts before 1800, but not after that date:

- (27) a. I see him *cross/crossing the street
b. I saw him cross/crossing the street

However, it is in fact used in one of the retellings of *The Quest*, witness (28), a continuation of (25):

- (28) and suddenly he sees water drip from the sky again

Dutch speakers use a motion verb + bare infinitive, and/or a passive construction, for (29):

- (29) a. *Passive*: mannetje wordt omvergeblazen door een blaadje dat in z'n gezicht waait/door een rondvliegend papiertje
'little man is being blown over by a sheet [of paper] blowing into his face/by a piece of paper flying about'
b. motion verb (*komen* 'come'): ho, er komt bijna papier tegen zijn hoofd aan
'ho, paper is nearly hitting his head' (lit. 'There comes almost paper against his head')
c. er komt een blaadje op hem af
'A sheet [of paper] is flying towards him' (lit. 'There comes a sheet towards him')

None of them use an AcI (*hij ziet een blaadje op zich afkomen* 'he sees a sheet come towards him'), possibly because the action affects the protagonist. The protagonist also functions as an endpoint of the action, making it bounded. Dutch speakers are however like the English speakers in their use of an AcI for (28), an unbounded event that does not affect the protagonist:

- (30) a. en dan ziet hij weer water druppelen
'and then he sees again water drip'
b. en hij hoort weer water druppelen
'and he hears again water drip'
c. en hij ziet weer waterdruppels op de stenen vallen
'and he sees again waterdrops fall onto the rocks'

The event is unbounded here with or without the presence of the place adverbial *op de stenen* 'onto the rocks' because the dripping will continue until the water runs out – the rocks are not an end-point. These two constructions, the AcI and the motion verb with a bare infinitive, are exactly the ones that have been claimed to express progressive aspect in OE: OE relied on motion and perception verbs followed by bare infinitives to indicate ongoing action (Richardson 1994: 318; Los 2005: 37).

Our conclusion is that Dutch sides with Old English and German, and against English, in their expression of ongoingness, in spite of the availability of the *aan het*-progressive..

5. Conclusions

This paper has looked at psycholinguistic evidence for the existence of a typological difference between German and English at the level of macrostructural planning (“deciding what to say and how to say it”) which influences the ways in which events are narrated and scenes are described in online, present tense retellings. The coding options proposed in the literature that accommodates this difference between a “bounded” and an “unbounded” system are the existence of verb-second syntax (for bounded systems like German) and the presence of a grammaticalized progressive (for unbounded systems like English). We have investigated the situation of Old English and Dutch, and concluded that Old English sides with German rather than with Present-Day English, but that Dutch takes up a middle position – it resembles PDE in terms of its predilection for subjects as clause-initial constituent, but it resembles German in terms of its predilection for deictic elements in its clause-initial constituents. The reason could be that verb-second in combination with a set of pronouns and adverbs that allow specific reference facilitates fine-grained expressions for time and place. The loss of that special linking position was compensated for by new strategies for creating subjects (by special passives) in English and also explains why English subjects are so much more “permissive” than Dutch or German ones. English lost verb-second in Late Middle English, and developed a grammaticalized progressive in Early Modern English. We argue that these two changes are related, and evidence of a typological switch, from bounded to unbounded. The position of Dutch remains an ambiguous one, and is further complicated in that Dutch has developed a progressive based on a locative construction, which is a feature of an unbounded system. However, this progressive does not appear to affect the bounded nature of the way events are construed and narrated.

References:

- Ball, Catherine N. 1991. *The Historical Development of the It-Cleft*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finnegan (1999). *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bohnacker, U. & C. Rosén. (2007). How to start a V2 declarative clause: Transfer of syntax vs. information structure in L2 German. *Papers from the Language Acquisition Workshop SCL 2006*, edited by Merete Anderssen & Marit Westergaard. *Nordlyd* 34.3: 29-56.
- Boogaart, R. (1999). *Aspect and Temporal Ordering: A Contrastive Analysis of Dutch and English*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Bouma, G. (2008). *Starting a Sentence in Dutch: A Corpus Study of Subject and Object Fronting*. Dissertation University of Groningen.
- Bouwman, Justine (2009). *Het Zandmannetje Is Walking naar het Water: The Spoken Description of Narratives by Dutch and English speakers and by Dutch students of English*. MA-thesis Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Carroll, Mary, Christiane von Steutterheim & Ralph Nuese (2004). The language and thought debate: A psycholinguistic approach. In: *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Language Production* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 157), ed. by Thomas Pechmann and Christopher Habel, 183–218. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carroll, Mary, Silvia Natale & Marianne Starren (2008). Acquisition du marquage du progressif par des apprenants germanophones de l'italien et néerlandophones du français, *AILE* (Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère) 26. 31–50.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2009). Word order and linear modification in English. *Brno Studies in English*, 35: 2, 17-28.

- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Comrie, B. (2000). Pragmatic Binding: Demonstratives as anaphors in Dutch. In Juge, M. L. & J. L. Moxley (eds.) *The Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 50-61.
- Cornelis, Louise (2000). Hier word(t) je niet gevraagd of je wel kunt ontleden. *Tekst[blad]* 6.2, 23-25.
- Denison, D. (1985). Why Old English had no prepositional passive. *English Studies* 66: 189-204.
- Engel, Ulrich (1974). Syntaktische Besonderheiten der deutschen Alltagssprache. In: *Gesprochene Sprache, Jahrbuch 1972, Sprache der Gegenwart* 26. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 199–228.
- Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine & Kåre Solfjeld (1994). Deutsche und norwegische Sachprosa im Vergleich: Ein Arbeitsbericht. *Arbeitsberichte des Germanischen Instituts der Universität Oslo* 6. Oslo.
- Fanego, Teresa (1992). *Infinitive Complements in Shakespeare's English*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico).
- Firbas, J. (1964). On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis. *TLP* 1, 267-280
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman & Wim van der Wurff (2000). *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gelderen, Elly van (2004). *Grammaticalization as Economy* (Linguistics Today 71). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hawkins, John (1986). *A comparative typology of English and German*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Healey, Antonetta diPaolo & Richard L. Venezky (1985 [1980]). *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*. Toronto: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2010). From V1 to V2 in West Germanic. *Lingua* 120: 2, 315-329.
- Jansen, Frank. (1981). *Syntaktische konstrukties in gesproken taal*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de Drie Grachten.
- Kampen, Jacqueline van (2007). Relative agreement in Dutch. In: *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2007*, edited by Bettelou Los & Marjo van Koppen, 112–24. Amsterdam/Philadelpia: Benjamins.
- Kampen, Jacqueline van (2010). Anaforische middelen voor topicverschuiving. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 15(2): 189-209.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1987). *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kemenade, Ans van, Tanya Milicev & R. Harald Baayen (2008). The balance between syntax and discourse in Old English. In: *English Historical Linguistics 2006*, Vol. I: *Syntax and Morphology*, edited by Maurizio Gotti, Martina Dossena & Richard Dury, 3–21. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kemenade, Ans van & Marit Westergaard (2012). Syntax and information structure: Verb-second variation in Middle English. In: *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in the History of English*, edited by Meurman-Solin, Anneli, Maria-José López-Couso & Bettelou Los, 87-120. New York: OUP.
- Killie, Kristin (2008). From locative to durative to focalized? The English progressive and 'PROG imperfective' drift. In: *English Historical Linguistics 2006*, Vol. I: *Syntax and*

- Morphology*, edited by Maurizio Gotti, Martina Dossena & Richard Dury, 69-88.
 Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1994). Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax. In: *Clause Structure and Language Change*, edited by Ian Roberts & Adrian Battye, 140-167. Oxford: OUP.
- Koster, Jan (1975). Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1: 111-36.
- Kranich, Svenja. (2010). *The Progressive in Modern English: A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization and Related Changes*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic Notions of Information Structure. In: *The Notions of Information Structure. Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 6, Working Papers of The Sonderforschungsbereich 632*, ed. Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow and Manfred Krifka, 13–55. Potsdam: Potsdam Universitätsverlag.
- Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor. 2000. Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, second edition.
- Kroch, Anthony, Ann Taylor & Don Ringe (2000). The Middle English Verb-Second Constraint: A case study in language contact and language change. In: *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, edited by Herring, Susan, Pieter van Reenen & Lene Schøsler, 353-91. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 353-91.
- Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, & Ariel Diertani. (2004). Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English.
- Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini & Ariel Diertani. (2010). Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lenker, Ursula (2007). *Forhwi* ‘because’: Shifting deictics in the history of English causal connection. In *Connectives in the history of English*, edited by Ursula Lenker & Anneli Meurman-Solin, 193-227. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Los, Bettelou (2005). *The Rise of the To-Infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Los, Bettelou (2009). The consequences of the loss of verb-second in English: information structure and syntax in interaction. *English Language and Linguistics* 13.1:97–125.
- Los, Bettelou (2012). The loss of verb-second and the switch from bounded to unbounded systems. In: *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in the History of English*, edited by Meurman-Solin, Anneli, Maria-José López-Couso & Bettelou Los, 21-46. New York: OUP.
- Mair, Christian (1990). *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English: A Study of Syntax in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McColl Millar, Robert. (2000). *System Collapse, System Rebirth: The Demonstrative Systems of English 900-1350 and the Birth of the Definite Article*. Bern/Oxford: Lang.
- Mitchell, Bruce, Catherine Ball & Angus Cameron (1975). Short titles of Old English texts. *Anglo-Saxon England* 4: 207-21.
- Mitchell, Bruce, Catherine Ball & Angus Cameron (1979). Addenda and corrigenda. *Anglo-Saxon England* 8: 331-3.
- Pérez-Guerra, Javier (2005). Word order after the loss of the verb-second constraint or the importance of early Modern English in the fixation of syntactic and informative (un-)markedness. *English Studies* 86: 342-69.
- Peterson, Eugene H. (2009) The Message Bible, Version Information. Colorado Springs. NavPress Publishing Group. <http://www.messagebible.com>. (accessed 24 April 2009).

- Richardson, P. (1994). Imperfective aspect and episode structure in Beowulf. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 93, 313-325.
- Rohdenburg, G. (1974). Sekundäre Subjektivierungen im Englischen und Deutschen: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zur Verb- und Adjektivsyntax. *PAKS-Arbeitsbericht* Nr. 8. Bielefeld: Cornelson-Velhagen and Klasing.
- Seoane, Elena (2006). Information structure and word order change: The passive as an information-rearranging strategy in the history of English. In: *The Handbook of the History of English*, edited by Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los, 360-91. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, Jeremy (1996). *An Historical Study of English: Function, Form and Change*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Stutterheim, Christiane von (2002). Konzeptualisierung und Versprachlichung von Ereignissequenzen. http://www.idf.uni-heidelberg.de/fileadmin/user_download/antrag_KVE.pdf (accessed 20 November 2009).
- Tavecchio, L.M. (2010). Sentence patterns in English and Dutch: A contrastive corpus analysis. Utrecht: LOT. Dissertation, VU University Amsterdam. Available from <http://www.lotpublications.nl/index3.html>
- Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Frank Beths.(2003). The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose. In Electronic texts and manuals available from the Oxford Text Archive.
- Virtanen, Tuija (1992). *Discourse functions of adverbial placement in English: clause-initial adverbials of time and place in narratives and procedural place descriptions*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Visser, F. Th. (1963-73). *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, Vols. 1-3b. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Vries, M. d. (2007). Dislocation and backgrounding. In: *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2007*, edited by Bettelou Los & Marjo van Koppen, 236-48. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Warner, A. (2007). Parameters of variation between verb-subject and subject-verb order in late Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics* 11: 81-111.